DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 219 JC 790 165

AUTHOR Hadley, Ollie E.; Andrews, James
TITLE The Development of a Questionnaire for an Organizational Development Program at Los Angeles Southwest College.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 45p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Institutional Research; Job Satisfaction; *Junior Colleges; Organizational Change; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Development; Peer Relationship; *Questionnaires; Research Design; School Surveys; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Morale; Teamwork; *Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

An Organizational Development (OD) questionnaire was designed at Los Angeles Southwest College to enhance planned change in that educational organization. The questionnaire measures attitudes in seven organizational development concept areas: (1) institutional climate indices--opportunity for advancement, general institutional conditions, concern for employees, and employee commitment; (2) supervisory indices--concern for faculty, concern for performance, building a work team, and helping in getting the work done; (3) work department indices--supporting each other, concern for performance, working as a team, helping each other, and understood and acceptable objectives of the group; (4) job indices--freedom to influence job and resources available to do the job; (5) institutional process indices--employee effort, sharing information, cooperation in solving problems, influence of top and lower level management on department, and making decisions; (6) institutional results--employee satisfaction, turnover readiness, absenteeism because of job tensions, and work group performance; and (7) goal-setting comparisons between "how it is" and "how I'd like it to be"--supervisory indices, work department indices, and institutional results. A literature review outlining the background of OD, a bibliography, and the questionnaire are included in the document. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167219

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AT LOS ANGELES SOUTHWEST COLLEGE

By

Cllie B. Hadley, M.B.A

Los Angeles Southwest College

James Andrews, Ed.D.
Santa Ana College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Andrews

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JULY 1978

JC 790 165

ABSTRACT

This study is designed to develop an Organizational Development (OD) program at Los Angeles Southwest College. Specifically, this study attempts to develop an OD Questionnaire.

Several methods were used to develop this Questionnaire:

1. Five administrators and five instructors were selected to form a Task Force. The Task Force major responsibility was to provide suggestions of the kind of (non-threatening) questions administrators and faculty members may be interested in answering. The Task Force met three times to provide input into development of the Questionnaire.

2. The Organizational Development Questionnaire was developed by the investigator in collaboration with the Task Force.

3. To insure that the Organizational Development Questionnaire was a valid instrument, it was validated by two certified psychologists.

4. The reliability was established with a pilot test of administrators and faculty members. The sample consisted of seven administrators and seven faculty members.

The Organizational Development Questionnaire was developed to measure attitudes in seven concept areas of Organizational Development (OD). These seven areas are: (1) Institutional climate; (2) Climate; (2) Supervisory, (3) Work department; (4) Your job; (5) Institutional process; (6) Institutional result; and, (7) Goal-setting comparison.

The following recommendations are made as a result of these findings:

1. The Organizational Development Questionnaire should be used as a basis for planned implementation of an Organization Development program at LASC.

2. Top administrators support for a development effort is essential.

3. A commitment and sincere desire to implement changes that improve institutional processes is also necessary. In addition, a prior commitment to not judge the effort prematurely, but to wait until a subsequence survey re-administration before evaluation is essential.

While these factors alone - support, commitment, and administrative involvement - do not guarantee the success of an OD program, they are nontheless essential

to a successful effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Title Page	i
	Abstract	ii
	Table of Contents	v
Chapter		
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Background and Significance	3
	Purpose of the Study	14
III.	Procedure	15
	Limitations	16
	Definition of Terms	16
IV.	Results	18
V.	Discussions, Implications and Recommendations	22
	Discussions and Implications	22
	Recommendations	25
	Bibliography	26
	Appendix A: Organizational Development Scale	29

INTRODUCTION

In the 1960's a new integrated type of training originated known as organizational development (OD). Organizational development is an educational strategy which focuses on the whole culture of the organization in order to bring about planned change. It seeks to change beliefs, attitudes, values, and structures - in fact, the entire culture of the organization - so that the organization can better adapt to technology and live with the fast pace of change.

The purpose of this paper is to recommend a strategy by which an Organizational Development (OD) program can be established at Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC). The recommended program is to be one which specifically focuses on the effectiveness of Los Angeles Southwest College Organization.

The recommended strategy will be based upon a research effort that the investigator has undertaken while instructing at LASC. This proposal will be centered around a pulling together of available, relevant information about the field of O.D. and an extensive review of the current literature on O.D. and the application of behavioral science knowledge to organizations.

This proposal will not allege to present the panacea for LASC to prevent any future organizational illness, nor will it presume that strategies other than the one recommended could not be successful. However, it will recommend a strategy whereby LASC can establish an O.D. program that will have the optimum probability of increasing the effectiveness of the organization.

This proposal will investigate Organizational Development efforts and what is inclusive of O.D. programs. It will establish an instrument that a change strategy intervention will be designed around and it will also review factors which are thought to be important to the success of the recommended program.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The term Organizational Development is a recent concept that has evolved in the past twenty-five years. The origins of O.D. relate primarily to three causes (Davis, 1977). First is the fact that the research structure on the job did not adequately reinforce training, so there was excessive loss of training momentum in the transition from a classroom to a work situation. Too many good training and development programs substantially failed because the mores and structures of the organization did not support the training. Under these conditions the reasonable next step is to try to change the entire organization so that it will support the training which is provided. This is exactly what O.D. tries to do.

A second reason is the fast pace of change itself, which requires that organizations be extremely effective in order to survive. O.D. attempts to develop the whole organization so that it can respond to change more uniformly and capably. It tries to "free up" communication by increasing the amount and candor of communication. It seeks to build problem-solving capability by improving group dynamics and problem confrontation. In short, it reaches into all aspects of organizational culture in order to make it more humanly responsive.

A third reason is the desire for more experiential learning processes in employee training, meaning that the trainees learn by actually experiencing in the training environment the kinds of behavioral problems they face on the job. Then they can discuss and analyze their own immediate experience, learning from it.

There are many definitions of O.D. that have been presented from a wide variety of sources. Frohman and Sashkin (1970) in reviewing O.D. have presented an explicit definition of the field:

> Operationally, organization development is a planned effort to improve the functioning and effectiveness of an entire system through the applications of behavioral science knowledge to the processes and structures of the system.

Beckhard (1969) asserts:

> Organizational development is an effort (1) planned, (2) organizationwide, and (3) managed from the top, to (4) increase organization effectiveness and health through (5) planned interventions in the organization's 'process', using behavioral science knowledge.

While O.D. is concerned with changing the processes and structures of the organization, these changes are made with one specific purpose in mind. That is to increase the effectiveness

of an organization to do its work. David Bowers (1971) in reviewing O.D., purposes that an O.D. effort should directly affect the basic dimensionality of that work; the volume of work done, the cost of doing the work, and the quality of the work. Generalizing from these definitions, it can be seen that the goals of O.D. efforts are usually changes in the organization that are beneficial or desirable to the management of an organization and its membership. Reeser and Loper (1978) state that the values that underlie many O.D. efforts have led to goals which include:

> Improved interpersonal communication skill and competence of members
>
> Recognition of emotions as a legitimate part of organizational behavior
>
> Improved understanding of group operations and development of teamwork skills
>
> Improvement of the capacity to manage conflict in the organization.

To gain further incite, O.D. may be understood in terms of a number of characteristics implied in its definition. One important characteristic is that O.D. focuses on a whole organization or major unit of it so that the environment around employees will tend to reinforce any learning that occurs in the program. An additional characteristic is that O.D. is systems-oriented, being concerned with intergroup relationships as well as interpersonal

ones. It is concerned with structure and process as well as attitudes.

Another characteristic of O.D. is that it is action research. It works with ongoing conditions, not artificial ones. A related characteristic is that O.D. is problem solving. It seeks to solve problems, rather than to discuss them theoretically.

An important behavioral characteristic of O.D. is that it uses group processes. There are group discussions, intergroup conflict, confrontation, and team building. Another characteristic of O.D. is that it relies heavily on feedback to participants so that they will have concrete data on which to make decisions.

Another characteristic of O.D. is experiential learning. People experience behavioral concepts instead of having an expert present them. A further characteristic of O.D. is that it is situational and contingency-oriented. Traditional training efforts historically tended to point to a one best way, but O.D. is more flexible and pragmatic, adapting actions to fit particular needs.

A final characteristic of O.D. is that normally it uses a change agent or consultant for the participating group. Change agents are process consultants rather than expert consultants, meaning that their role is to guide groups toward more effective group processes (Davis, 1977).

Thus it can be concluded that an O.D. effort is concerned with the change of a total organization and not just a few groups or individuals, and will also impinge on the processes by which the organization functions.

Briefly, let's take a look at the change process involved in an O.D. effort. Surprisingly, there are more than just a few different types of change processes. Using just three variables; mutual goal setting, deliberateness of change, and power distribution among the parties, Warren Bennis (1962) has identified eight different types of change processes. The differences in these processes center around the balance of the three variables between the organization and the individuals in the organizations.

The definition of O.D. already presented states that the change effort is a planned one. A planned change effort is one whereby there is equal participation in the setting of goals, where those parts of the organization in which change is desired are not forced to (unequal power balance such as in a prison), and where everyone involved in the effort are conscious of trying to change.

Motivation for change in an organization can be created from several different sources. External pressure on an organization such as government legislation and internal pressure such as a union demand are two examples of such sources. The most effective

motivation for a change effort however is a realization that the actual state of the organization differs from what the desired state of the organization is.

There are many events that can transpire in the change process and these events along with their sequence can determine the effectiveness of a change effort. Bowers and Franklin (1972) has suggested a sequence of events for an effective change process that includes informational inputs; formation of a model; selection of a goal; assessment of the situation; formation of a diagnosis; feedback; adjustment; and reevaluation.

Informational inputs from several sources including internal storage and generation, external environmental forces, and higher level organizational systems lead to the formation of a model of how the organization should operate. This model in an O.D. effort would represent several different dimensions such as opportunity for advancement in the organization or the satisfaction of employees.

From the model established, the organization would select goals in the different dimensions and then determine the position of the organization relative to the goals selected. Once the present situation, or position, of the organization is determined then a diagnosis can be made as to the problems that exist. Feedback of this information allows the organization to determine the causes

of existing problems and the reasons for discrepancies. From this the organization can make a planned and directed effort to adjust the existing discrepancies between the actual and desired states. The final step in the change process would be to reevaluate the organization and determine the effectiveness of the change effort.

Now that we have discussed the change process used in O.D., it is appropriate to review some factors which contribute to the success or failure of any O.D. effort. These are only a few of the factors which are critical to the success of an O.D. intervention program.

It has already been noted that the organization's motivation is the starting point for an O.D. program. It must also be realized that the motivation is crucial to the success of an O.D. program. Unless the top administrators responsible for initiating an O.D. program in an organization are motivated by a sincere desire to move the organization from its present state to a more effective one, the program is headed for serious difficulties if not failure. With some other type of motivation resulting from either internal or external pressures the commitment for change will be less and the support for any program will also be substantially less.

Motivation, commitment, and support for change must be present at all levels of the organization. However, it is advisable to start

at the top and work downward so that commitment and support established at any one level is not blocked by higher levels resisting the change.

Burke and Schmidt (1971) state that the role of a change agent is extremely important to the success of any O.D. effort. The change agent is that person who acts as a linking pin between the organization and its particular situation on one hand, and the behavioral science knowledge, change process experience, and the available O.D. resources on the other. The O.D. change agent, whether an external consultant or from an internal staff, must be competent in at least five general areas.

1. Skill and knowledge in applied behavioral science and O.D. techniques.
2. The ability to diagnose accurately problems of an organizational nature.
3. Understanding and skill in the consultative process.
4. An understanding of the dynamics and realities of planned change.
5. The ability to function as facilitator and/or catalyst within the organization.

A third critical issue to O.D. efforts is the resistance to change by individuals and groups within a system. Resistance takes the form of any action or behavior which an individual undertakes to protect himself from the effects of a change effort. It is important to be able to recognize the reasons for resistance to change

and to understand how to reduce resistance for an O.D. effort to be successful.

The work of Alvin Zander (1962) is relevant here as he has examined the issue of resistance to organizational change and possible sources of resistance. He lists six conditions that are conducive to resistance:

1. Resistance may be expected if the change ignores the already established institutions in the group.

2. Resistance may be expected if the change is made on personal grounds rather than impersonal requirements.

3. Resistance may be expected to the degree that the persons influenced by the change have pressure put upon them to make it, and will be decreased to the degree that these same persons are able to have some "say" in the nature or direction of the change.

4. Resistance can be expected when those influenced are caught in a jam between strong forces pushing them to make the change and strong forces deterring them against making the change.

5. Different people will see different meanings in the proposed change...some workers saw the change as an indication that they had been doing a poor job, others assumed it meant their office would soon be abolished, still others were troubled since they were losing some of the power they had formerly controlled.

6. Resistance can be expected if the nature of the change is not made clear to the people who are going to be influenced by the change.

This list is not meant to be all inclusive, rather it is intended to point out that any organization considering a change effort must be aware of the possibility of resistance to that effort occurring.

Zander (1962) also proposes a major principle in preventing resistance to change:

> Resistance will be prevented to the degree that the changer helps the changees to develop their own understanding of the need for the change, and an explicit awareness of how they feel about it, and what can be done about those feelings.

The majority of available research on change efforts agrees whole-heartedly with Zander about the role of involving the individual in the change process. Satisfaction with change and a reduction of resistance to change both increase with the amount of participation of the individual in the change process.

In applying O.D. to LASC there are certain objectives that should be relevant to any effort undertaken. First of all, any O.D. effort should have as a major objective to increase the effectiveness of the functioning of the organization. The strategy for accomplishing this is to develop within the college the ability to diagnose its problems, the ability to analyze the causes of these problems and to plan solutions to these problems, and the ability to implement these solutions at all levels of the college. Burke and Schmidt (1971) view this as developing the organizations ability to take full advantage of the human resources the organization has available to it.

Any O.D. effect undertaken at LASC should also meet certain requirements that are relevant to its operations. First, any O.D.

effort should provide a means of diagnosing the problems and provide a reading of the situation of the organization. Without an idea of where the college is, it is impossible to plan the direction of a change effort to reach where the organization wants to be.

Second, any effort undertaken should provide for a process by which the college can take action on these problems and implement solutions.

Third, any effort should provide documentation of the efforts taken and be able to measure the impact of the actions that are taken.

The assumptions so far have been that organization effectiveness is dependent upon the organization's processes by which it can diagnose and solve problems. From organization effectiveness the activity or output of the organization is dependent. The dimensions of effectiveness noted earlier were the volume of work, the cost of work, and the quality of work. Ultimately any measure of success for an O.D. program is dependent on the change in the dimensions of effectiveness of the college.

Any program undertaken at LASC should also be ultimately judged on its impact on "hard" indicators. It is vital to recognize that there is a lag between intervention, a change in the organizations processes, a change in the organizations effectiveness and the resultant change in the output of the organization.

It is extremely important then that any O.D. effort undertaken at LASC be accompanied by a commitment to evaluate the short term investment by the long run change in organizational activity.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Although the primary purpose of this study is to create an OD Program for LASC, the major objective of this investigation is to develop a questionnaire that is applicable to measuring OD at a community college. A review of the literature shows that there are no scales available to measure OD at the community college level. Thus, it is the goal of this study to develop such a scale and offer a recommended strategy for its utilization at college level. The goals of this study will essentially focus on the following points:

1. Development of a questionnaire for college use in relation to OD.
2. Present a theoretical assumption on an OD program.

This study will not attempt to, nor place emphasis on:

1. The statistical relevance of the questionnaire.
2. Empirically validate the questionnaire.
3. Statistically, analyze the scale for utilization at the college level.

PROCEDURE

This study was designed to develop an OD program at LASC. More specifically, this study attempted to develop an OD Questionnaire.

The study was conducted at LASC during the Spring semester 1977/1978 school year. The sample for this study consisted of the following:

1. Five administrators and five instructors were selected to form a Task Force. These individuals were selected because of their perception toward an OD program at LASC. The Task Force major responsibility was to provide suggestions of the kind of (non-threatening) questions administrators and faculty members may be interested in answering. The Task Force met three times to provide input into development of the Questionnaire.

2. The Organizational Development Questionnaire (see Appendix A), was developed by the investigator in collaboration with the Task Force.

3. To insure that the Organizational Development Questionnaire was a valid instrument, it was validated by two certified psychologists.

4. The reliability was established with a pilot test of administrators and faculty members. The

sample consisted of seven administrators and seven faculty members.

On the basis of data elicited, recommendations were made regarding Organizational Development Questionnaire use at Los Angeles Southwest College, and the implication it has on the development of a program.

LIMITATIONS

This study was designed to develop a questionnaire to create an OD Program at LASC. Obviously, there are several limitations inherent in a study of this type.

The first and foremost limitation is the concept of developing a questionnaire to measure OD and to validate its reliability. Since the focus of this study is to develop the scale, it is impossible to empirically validate this scale.

The second limitation is the sample used in this study. The sample is so small, it is impossible to generalize the results beyond the population investigated.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Change Agent - An individual whose primary job is to bring about normative change in the organization. He may plan and manage OD programs to meet the organizations needs; he may be the facilitators in group interactions. The

Internal Change Agent - A member of the organizations whose role or job is facilitating change within the organization. The External Change Agent - An outside consultant that aids the organization by assisting the internal change or facilitating change himself.

Change Process - Any process, model, or series of actions designed and implemented within a system with the desired results being a change within the system.

Environment - Used to refer to the physical and social context within which any target system is functioning, be it a person, group or organization.

Feedback - Information; the act of informing a person, group or system, etc. the effect of that person's, group's, etc. behavior on another.

Measurement - Any process, technique, or situation that provides information, quantifiable and/or qualitative, concerning what the level of change, awareness, feeling, etc. is of a person, group, or organization, etc. Measurement Instrument - A specific process technique, or situation used to gain information, quantifiable and/or qualitative, about a person, group, or organization, etc. Specific instruments are designed to provide specific types of information (e.g. communication level, amount of trust, feeling toward some attitude object). Various

instrument types are the: Survey, questionnaire, group developed questionnaire, interview, and situational types.

Organizational Development (OD) - A planned effort to improve the functioning and effectiveness of an entire system through the applications of behavioral science knowledge to the processes and structure of the system.

Survey-Guided Development - A method by which an organization can improve its effectiveness and functioning through a carefully monitored effort.

RESULTS

This study was designed to develop a questionnaire for an Organizational Development program at Los Angeles Southwest College. The Organizational Development Questionnaire (ODQ) is the first phase toward implementing an OD program at LASC.

The major dimensions included in this ODQ are defined by the following indices along with each question relating to specific area of concern (see Appendix A):

Institutional Climate Indices

Opportunity for Advancement (Q 1,2): How employees describe their institution's promotional opportunities.
General Institution Conditions (Q 3,4,5): This index reflects the current "health" of the institution. How

positively employees describe their institutions, especially the planning and managing functions.

Concern for Employees (Q. 6,7): How employees view their institution's concern with their working conditions and how employees feel about them.

Employee Commitment (Q 8, 9): The pride employees have in working for their institutions and their commitment to the educational goals.

Supervisory Indices

Concern for Us (Q. 10, 15): Faculty descriptions of the extent to which they see their supervisors as concerned with their problems.

Concern for Performance (Q. 11, 17): Indicates how much employees see their supervisor as setting an example by working hard, and expecting them to work hard.

Building a Work Team (Q. 12, 19): The extent to which employees describe their supervisor as encouraging them to work as a team and to exchange their opinions and ideas.

Help in Getting the Work Done (Q. 13, 21): Extent to which the supervisor is seen as helpful in providing them with information they need to schedule work and improve their performance.

Work Department Indices

Supporting Each Other (Q. 22, 29): Reflects employee descriptions of how much work department members listen to and are friendly with each other.

Concern for Performance (Q. 23, 31): Describes the extent to which the work department maintains efficiency and high performance standards.

Working as a Team (Q. 24, 33): Indicates to what extent employees say team spirit, trust and confidence exist in their work department.

Helping Each Other in Our Work (Q. 25, 35): Index of work department cooperation in solving job-related problems.

Understood and Acceptable Objectives (Q. 26, 27): Extent to which work department members understand and accept the goals of the group.

Your Job Indices

Freedom to Influence Job (Q. 36, 37, 40): The extent to which employees indicate their jobs provide opportunities for decision-making, a chance to use their ideas, and freedom from routine.

Resources Available to Do the Job (Q. 38, 42, 44): Employee descriptions of the extent to which the information, equipment, resources, and training requirements of the job are present.

Institutional Process Indices

Employee Effort (Q. 45, 46): Indicates the amount of effort employees put into their jobs, and how much of that effort is lost or not productive.

Sharing Information (Q. 47,48,49): The extent to which information is readily available within the institution for effective decision-making and work performance.

Cooperation in Solving Problems (Q. 50,51,52): Employee descriptions of the extent to which their departments work together in solving problems.

Influence -- Top Management (Q. 53-55): Indicates how much influence is exerted by these groups over what goes on in the employee's department.

Influence -- Lower Level Management (Q. 57,58,59): Same as above for lower-level management groups.

Making Decisions (Q. 60,61): The extent to which decision-making is described as involving those affected and being done by those who know the most about the problem.

Institutional Results

Satisfaction (Q. 69): Separate questions are available for determining satisfaction in such areas as pay, supervision, job, and training. This index uses employees' rating of overall satisfaction in the institution.

Turnover Readiness (Q. 70): Indicates how frequently employees have considered leaving their institution during the past year.

Absenteeism because of Job Tensions (Q. 71): Frequency with which employees indicate they have been absent from work because of job-related tensions.

Work Group Performance (Q. 73): After describing the extent to which employees would like their work department to

complete its goals, they indicate on this question the extent to which the department meets goals now.

Goal-Setting Comparisons

Comparisons between "How It Is Now" and "How I'd Like It To Be" are available for the following indices:

Supervisory Indices

Concern for Us (Q. 15 with 14)

Concern for Performance (Q. 17 with 16)

Building a Work Team (Q. 19 with 18)

Help in Getting the Work Done (Q. 21 with 20)

Work Department Indices

Supporting Each Other (Q. 29 with 28)

Concern for Performance (Q. 31 with 30)

Working as a Team (Q. 33 with 32)

Helping Each Other in our Work (Q. 35 with 34)

Institutional Results

Work Department Performance (Q. 72 with 73)

DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Organizational Development Questionnaire (ODQ) was developed to measure attitudes in seven concept areas of Organizational Development (OD). These seven areas are: (1) Institutional climate; (2) Supervisory; (3) Work department; (4) Your job; (5) Institutional process; (6) Institutional result; and (7) Goal-setting comparison.

Specifically, the ODQ is the first phase toward implementing an OD program at Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC).

Educational institutions are known for their problem-solving ability, but they do not appear to be so proficient when it comes to people problems. In order to solve any problem, its exact nature must be known. The state of the art for measuring the human side of the organizatins is full of theories. In an attempt to further develop the state of the art, an ODQ was developed.

The ODQ is a 79-item structured questionnaire. This survey permits individuals to describe their institution in terms of factors considered important to institutional health and effectiveness.

With a few exceptions, the questionnaire items can be used in surveys in some colleges. They provide meaningful information with which to assess current effectiveness and areas of potential with respect to the institutional's human resources.

The ODQ was developed to make possible assessment of major institutional areas with little cost at the minimum of administration and completion time. There are at least four major uses for the ODQ. They are as follows:

To Identify Problem Areas. The ODQ can provide preliminary diagnosis of the current health and effectiveness of an Institution or sub-unit. Use of the ODQ as a diagnostic tool can aid administrators in assigning priorities to emerging problem areas before they influence end-result measures, and permit a concentration of effort in certain departments or management levels for maximum returns.

To Afford An Additional Channel of Communication. By specifying the need option, results from the ODQ can be used to increase communication among employees in a work group and their supervisor. This option may be particularly appropriate for an immediate staff as part of an initial organizational development effort.

To Measure the Impact of Actions Taken. The ODQ is appropriate for measuring the "before" and "after" impact of various programs or activities.

To Compare Views of Institutional Units or Other Subgroups. Since all survey data will be stored in a central location, management in one location will be able to compare their results with other comparable institutions. It is possible to use the ODQ to compare one department with another.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to develop a questionnaire for an Organizational Development Program at Los Angeles Southwest College. The following recommendations are made as a result of this study:

1. The ODQ should be used as a basis for planned implementation of an OD program at LASC.
2. Top administrators support for a development effort is essential. Without full support, any program undertaken will be doomed to failure before starting.
3. A commitment and sincere desire to implement changes that improve institutional processes is also necessary. In addition, a prior commitment to not judge the effort prematurely but to wait until a subsequence survey readministration before evaluation is essential.

While these factors alone; support, commitment, and administrative involvement, do not guarantee the success of an OD program, they are nonetheless essential to a successful effort. The researcher does not purport to have the one solution to educational institution ills but does firmly believe that the OD program is a viable approach for improving the effectiveness of LASC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alper, William S. and Klein, Stuart M., "Feedback Following Opinion Surveys", Personnel Administration, November-December 1970, Volume 33, Number 6.

Argyris, C., Intervention Theory and Method, Addison Wesley Publishing, Reading Mass., 1970.

Bartlett, Alton C. and Kayser, Thomas A., "Organizational Change; A Trial Synthesis", Bartlett and Kayser (Eds.), Changing Organizational Behavior, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973.

Beckhard, Richard, Organizational Development: Strategies and Models, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading Mass., 1969.

Bennis, Warren G., "A Typology of Change Processes", in Warren Bennis, Kenneth Benne and Robert Chin (Eds.), The Planning of Change, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1962.

Bowers, David G., A Taxonomy of Intervention, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1971.

Bowers, David G., Perspectives in Organizational Development, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1971.

Bowers, David G. and Franklin, Jerome L.,Basic Concepts of Survey Feedback, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.

Burke, W. Warner and Schmidt, Warren H.,"Primary Target for Change: The Manager or the Organization?", Harvey Hornstein, Barbara Bunker, Warner Burke, Marion Gindes and Roy Lewicki (Eds.) Social Intervention A Behavioral Science Approach, The Free Press, New York, 1971.

Davis, Keith, Human Behavior At Work, McGraw Hill Book Co., San Francisco, Calif., 1977.

Franklin, Jerome L., Organizational Development: An Annotated Bibliography, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.

Frohman, Mark A. and Sashkin, Marshall, The Practice of Organization Development: A Selective Review, Technical Report to the Office of Naval Research, 1970.

Greiner, Larry E., "Patterns of Organization Change", Harvard Business Review, 45, No. 3, (May-June, 1967).

Havelock, R. and Havelock, M., Training for Change Agents, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.

Institute for Social Research, Organizational Development Project Feedback Package, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbon, Michigan, 1972.

Jones, G.N., Planned Organizational Change, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

Kraut, Allen I., "Opinion Surveys: Turning Results into Action", Personnel, Volume 43, No. 56, September/October 1966.

Lorsch, L. and Lawrence, P., The Diagnosis of Organizational Problems, in Bennis W., Beene, K., Chin R., The Planning of Change, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969.

Mann, Floyd C., "Studying and Creating Change: A Means to Understanding Social Organization", Harvey Hornstein, Barbara Bunker, Warner Burke, Marion Gindes, Roy Lewicki (Eds.), Social Intervention: A Behavioral Science Approach, The Free Press, New York, 1971.

Neff, Frank W., "Survey Research: A Tool for Problem Diagnosis and Improvement in Organizations", Alvin Gouldner and S.M. Miller (Eds.) Applied Sociology, The Free Press, New York, 1965.

N.T.L. Institute, "What is O.D.?", News and Reports, 2, No. 3, (June, 1968).

Reeser, Clayton and Loper, Marvin, Management: The Key to Organizational Effectiveness, Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois, 1978.

Schein, Edgar A., Process Consultation: Its Role in Organization Development, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1969.

Taylor, James C., and Bowers, David G., Survey of Organizations: A Machine-Scored Standardized Questionnaire Instrument, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1972.

Zandar, Alvin, "Resistance to Change - Its Analysis and Prevention", Warren Bennis, Kenneth Benne, and Robert Chin (Eds.) The Planning of Change, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1962.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to help you describe how people work together in your institution and how well it is running today.

You should answer each question as honestly as you can so your answers, along with those of other employees, will provide a good description of what it is like to work here.

Except for the survey administrators, no one in your institution will see your filled-out survey. To be sure that your answers will not be identified, please do not write your name on the form.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. All questions are completed by filling (circling) in one of the answers. If you do not find the exact answer that fits in your case, use the one that is closest to it.

2. Remember, the value of your answers depends on your being honest in completing this survey. You will not be identified with your answers.

3. If you feel some questions do not apply, <u>just leave them blank</u>.

4. Now that you have completed the instructions, please begin with question 1 on the following page.

ABOUT THIS INSTITUTION

All the questions below are about what it is like to work for this Institution in general.

To What Extent:

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

1. Does this Institution have a promotional system that lets the best qualified person rise to the top?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Has this Institution kept your way open to advancement?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Do employees talk favorably about this Institution?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Does this Institution plan work effectively?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Is this Institution better run now than in the past?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Does this Institution attempt to improve your working conditions?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Is this Institution interested in how people feel about working here?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Are you proud to work for this Institution.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Do you feel a responsibility to help this Institution meet its goals?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ABOUT YOUR SUPERVISOR

These next questions are about your supervisor. Remember, your supervisor is that person you report to directly.

To What Extent:

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

10. Is your supervisor willing to listen to your problems?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Does your supervisor expect you do work hard?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Does your supervisor encourage your Department to work as a team?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Does your supervisor provide you with the information you need to schedule work ahead of time?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

For the following set of items: Please read each question, and then answer how you'd like it to be, and how it is now.

Does your supervisor pay attention to what you're saying?

14. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Does your supervisor set an example by working hard?

16. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Does your supervisor encourage your Department to exchange opinions and ideas with each other?

18. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Does your supervisor show you how to improve your performance?

20. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

YOUR WORK DEPARTMENT

The questions below are about your work department. Remember, your work department consists of all the people who report to the same supervisor you do.

To What Extent:

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

22. Are the persons in your work Department friendly and easy to approach?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Does your work Department maintain high standards of performance?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Do members of your work Department have trust and confidence in each other?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Does your work Department offer new ideas for solving job-related problems?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Are the purposes or goals of your work Department clear to you?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Do you agree with the goals of your work Department?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

For the following set of items: Please read each question and then answer how you'd like it to be, and how it is now.

Does your work Department pay attention to what you're saying?

28. This is how I'd like them to do it....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Here's the way they do it now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

For the following set of items: Please read each question and then answer how you'd like it to be, and how it is now.

Does your job give you a chance to use your own ideas?

39. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Do you have the training you need to do your job well?

41. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Do you have the information you need to do your job well?

43. This is how I'd like it to be.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. Here's how it is now.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

45. Compared to the amount of effort you know you could put into doing your job (if it really "turned you on"), how much effort to you find yourself putting into your job on a day-to-day basis?

Much less effort - less than half the effort I know I could put into my job if it really turned me on.....	1
About half (50%) of the effort I know I could.....	2
A little more than half (60-70%) of the effort I know I could.....	3
About 75% as much effort into my job as I could...	4
A little more than three-quarters as much effort (80-85%) as I know I could.....	5
Almost as much effort (90-95%) as I know I could..	6
Just as much effort as I could...this job really "turns me on".....	7

46. In your opinion, how much of the effort you put into doing your job is lost or not productive because of things on the job over which you personally have no control?

A Great Deal of My Effort is Lost (55% or more).. 1

About ½ of My Effort is Lost (50%)..... 2

Somewhat Less than ½ of My Effort is Lost (30-45%)..... 3

About ¼ of My Effort is Lost (25%)..... 4

Less than ¼ of My Effort is Lost (10-20%)..... 5

Very Little of My Effort is Lost (5%)..... 6

None of My Effort is Lost (0%)..... 7

SHARING INFORMATION

To What Extent:

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

47. Are top Administrators aware of the problems at your level?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. Is the amount of information you get about what is going on in other Departments enough to do your job well?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. Is the amount of information you get about what is going on in other areas enough to do your job well?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

COOPERATION IN SOLVING PROBLEMS

To What Extent:

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

50. Do departments that need to pull together "on the same team" really help each other?.. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51. Are problems between Departments faced openly and cleared up instead of being "swept under the rug?..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52. [illegible]

INFLUENCE

As you see it, in general, how much say do each of the following have on what goes on in your department?

To What Extent?

7. Complete Say
6. Very Great Deal
5. Great Deal
4. Some
3. Little
2. Very Little
1. No Say

53. Board of Trustees..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

54. Chancellor..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

55. President..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

56. Local Union Leaders..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

57. Deans, Assistant (Deans, Chairpersons).. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

58. Instructor..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

59. Department Heads..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MAKING DECISIONS

To What Extent:

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

60. When you are affected by a decision, are you asked for your ideas before the decision is made?..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

61. Are decisions made by those people who know the most about the problem?..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

YOUR REACTIONS TO WORKING HERE

Considering everything, how satisfied are you:

7. Completely Satisfied
6. Very Satisfied
5. Satisfied
4. Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied
3. Dissatisfied
2. Very Dissatisfied
1. Completely Dissatisfied

62. With your job?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63. With your opportunities to get a better job in this Institution?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64. To stay in your present job?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65. With your pay (considering your skills and the effort you put into the work?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66. With the information you receive on what is going on in your Institution?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67. With your supervisor?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68. With the people in your work Department?....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69. Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction at this Institution at the present time?.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

70. Within the past year, did you ever have thoughts of leaving this Institution?

Yes, all the time..... (1)
Yes, almost weekly..... (2)
Yes, at least once a month... (3)
Yes, occasionally during this year..... (4)
Yes, maybe once or twice.... (5)
Yes, but never seriously.... (6)
No..... (7)

71. How often would you estimate you are absent from work during the year because of job-related problems or tensions?

Over 14 days..... (1)
10-14 days..... (2)
6-9 days..... (3)
3-5 days..... (4)
1-2 days..... (5)
Less than 1 day..... (6)
Never..... (7)

For the following item: Please read the question and then answer how you'd like it to be, and how it is now.

7. Completely
6. To A Very Great Extent
5. To A Great Extent
4. To Some Extent
3. To A Little Extent
2. To A Very Little Extent
1. Not At All

To what extent does your work Department complete its missions or achieve its goals?

72. This is how I'd like us to be..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
73. Here's how we do it now..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

ABOUT YOURSELF

These next questions relate most closely to you and how you feel about certain things. They are included to better understand how different groups of people (e.g. male and female groups) see this Institution differently. You may leave these questions blank if you don't want to answer them.

74. Your Sex: Male (1) Female (2)

75. How old are you?

Under 20 years of age.....(1)
20-24.....(2)
25-29 .....(3)
30-34.....(4)
35-39.....(5)
40-44.....(6)
45-49.....(7)
50-54.....(8)
55 or over.....(9)

76. What is the highest level of formal education you have completed?

Completed some graduate training?..... (1)
Completed a graduate degree
(Master's, Ph.D., etc.)..... (2)

77. While you were growing up, until you were about eighteen, what kind of community did you generally live in?

Rural or farm ..... (1)
Town or small city not near large city.. (2)
Suburban area near large city..... (3)
Large city..... (4)

78. How long have you worked for LASC?

1 to less than 2 years..... (1)
2 to less than 3 years..... (2)
3 to less than 5 years..... (3)
5 years to less than 10 years..... (4)
10 years to less than 15 years..... (5)

79. How would you feel about working on a job where the ways of doing things were always being changed to break the routine?

Would never feel at ease..... (1)
Would seldom feel at ease..... (2)
Would not bother me..... (3)
Would like it somewhat..... (4)
Would like it very much..... (5)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
APR 6 1979
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES